

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/666,854	FEHRER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Ronald D Hartman Jr.	2121	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Ronald D Hartman Jr. (3) _____

(2) Linda Deschere. (4) _____

Date of Interview: 01 December 2004.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: n/a.

Identification of prior art discussed: _____

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The attorney of record asked to have the Finality of the office action mailed on 10/19/2004. Upon further review of the prosecution history, it is the examiners opinion that the office action mailed on 10/19/2004 should not have been FINAL, but rather a Non-Final office action because this was the first time the applicant had a chance to respond to the newly applied art rejections set forth in the aforementioned office action, and therefore, the Finalty is withdrawn, and the previous office is being mailed again in order to restart the period for reply, in order to further assist the applicant..